ED 325 941 EA 022 429

AUTHOR McLaughlin, John M.; Moore, Charles E.
TITLE The Reform Movement and Ed.D. Expansion.
PUB DATE Oct 90
NOTE 12p.; Paper presented at the Fall Meeting of the Midwest Council for Educational Administration (St. Cloud, MN, October 26, 1990).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Administrator Education; College Curriculum; *Doctoral Degrees; Doctoral Programs; *Educational Administration; Elementary Secondary Education; Graduate Study; Higher Education; Professional Education; *School Restructuring; *Schools of Education; *Specialist in Education Degrees

ABSTRACT

The status of current doctoral administrator preparation programs is analyzed. An assessment of 17 doctorate of education programs in administration and leadership concludes that they do not differ significantly from traditional doctorate programs in education in terms of curriculum, student admissions, exit criteria, delivery format, and dissertations. A conclusion is that change and improvement of administrator preparation programs is necessary for the improvement of public schools. (15 references) (LMI)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

SCOPE OF INTEREST NOTICE

The ERIC Facility has assigned this document for processing to: EA

In our judgment, this document is also of interest to the Clearinghouses noted to the right. Indexing should reflect their special points of view. HE

ED325941

THE REFORM MOVEMENT and Ed.D. EXPANSION

BY

John M. McLaughlin
Charles E. Moore
Center for Educational Administration
and Leadership
St. Cloud State University

PREPARED FOR

Midwest Council of Educational Administration
Fall Conference
October 26, 1990
Sunwood Inn
St. Cloud, Minnesota

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

J. McLaughlin
C. Moore

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

EA 022 457

Era of Reform

Since the National Commission on Excellence in Education released A Nation at Risk in 1983, over 30 major reports have found their way into the fabric of educational reform and restructuring (Murphy, 1990). These reports have called for changes in the curriculum of K-12 schools, altering K-12 instructional methods, tinkering with governance of K-12 schools, reforming teacher education, and strengthening the principalship. There have been so many reports that it now requires a report on reports to keep them all in perspective. What are the implications of these reports on the development of Ed.D. programs in educational administration and leadership? What has been the net expansion of the Ed.D. in the 1980s? Do these new programs differ from other Ed.D. offerings?

First, there emerges from these reform efforts, at least six macro-level issues that pressure administrator preparation programs to reform (Murphy, 1990) It is clear from this body of reports that the school administrator has once again emerged as the key individual in school improvement (Boyer, 1983; Goodlad, 1984; Griffiths, 1988; Mitchell, & Cunningham, 1990; Sizer, 1985). Second, there is an increasing effort to bring about a paradigm shift in the organization, governance, and management of schools (Anderson, 1990; Kelley, 1990; Mitchell & Cunningham, 1990; Meade, 1990; Office of Educational Leadership, 1990). Third, there is a growing realization that administrators are often inept managers of the technical core of operations. For example, many administrators know more about the theory of instruction than they know about the construction of an appropriate lesson plan. According to Murphy current administrators have been de-skilled in the day-to-day operation of schools. Next, there is disenchantment with the theory movement in

school administration. Fifth, there is disgruntlement with the prevailing university training model (Cunningham, 1985; Thompson & Bailey, 1990). There have been numerous calls for a transformation of the manner in which administrators are prepared from - course content to the delivery of instruction. Finally, the perception among many is that there has been, and will be, little change in administrative practice.

As the focus shifts from pressures to reform to specific actions, once again six themes begin to emerge (Murphy, 1990). Preparation programs are chided for the way they recruit and select candidates. Current practice suggests that most degree candidates self-select into programs of school administration. In addition, educational administration students score in the lowest quartile on the graduate record exams. Only four graduate disciplines score lower.

Once into educational administration programs, candidates are exposed to a wide and varied range of course content. This is, in part, due to the fact that many professors of educational administration and leadership cannot agree on what should be included in programs preparing school administrators. Related to content is delivery, the dominant method in most programs of school administration is delivery of content in an evening course format. While this method may be efficient, many question its effectiveness. Further, even with this traditional delivery system, there could be a variety of instructional approaches, but there are not.

How are students evaluated? If leadership is a critical component of school administration, how, or is it, evaluated in educational administration programs? The truth is, because leadership is so difficult to identify and evaluate, it is often neglected Additionally, how are programs evaluated? Charged with preparing leaders for tomorrow's schools, there is little in

place to judge what is delivered in educational administration programs against what is needed in K-12 education.

Finally, there is a need to examine certification and induction issues. Currently, there are 50 certification models across the country. What, if anything, distinguishes these models, and what are some common components? Once a candidate completes a program and is certified, what happens to them? Is there institutional follow-up to determine whether the candidate is surviving? It seems as though many schools of educational administration lack the vision or incentive to create an induction program.

In an effort to bring clarity to a plethora of confusing reports, ten national organizations, with some influence in administrator preparation programs corroborated on the formation of The National Policy Board for Educational Administration. The ten organizations were:

--American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education

--American Association of School Administrators

--Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development

--Association of School Business Officials

--Council of Chief State School Officers

--National Association of Elementary School Principals

--National Association of Secondary School Principals

--National Council of Professors of Educational Administration

--National School Boards Association

--University Council for Educational Administration

The purpose of this group has been to conduct a comprehensive evaluation of current programs, and report and recommend strategies to strengthen administrator preparation. When the NPB released its first set of

recommendations in the spring of 1989, there were nine points in three broad categories (NPBEA, 1989). These included Programs: (1) the Ed.D. was to become the prerequisite for national certification and state licensure, (2) each program must include one full-time year of academic residency and one full-time year of field residency, (3) training programs must establish formal relationships between universities and school districts, and (4) all programs must transmit a common core of knowledge.

The second broad category of recommendations from the NPB focused on People. There are three subcategories to people. First, schools must engage in vigorous recruitment strategies. This is needed to bring quality to the candidate pool and bring women and people of color to educational administration programs. Next, the NPB called for a dramatic raise in the entrance standards to preparation programs and stated that the quality of faculty in preparation programs must be ensured.

The final category identified in this initial NPB report was Assessment. There were two major initiatives addressed: (1) it was recommended that a national certification examination for licensure be created, and (2) that the NPB establish an accreditation process for administrator preparation programs.

In March of 1990, the NPB issued a revised set of standards that moved away from some of the earlier recommendations and expanded others. For example, the NPB now calls for national certification at two levels. An entry level certificate would be granted to individuals holding a master's degree in a teaching area plus 30 additional credits in leadership. Advanced certification would require the doctorate.

The March, 1990, standards identified a specific knowledge base that embodied the social sciences, learning theory and practice, leadership and management functions, policy development, assessment and ethical issues. These March standards also called for a delivery system that was, in part, site based, included performance based instruction, and called on programs to engage in active recruiting efforts.

Finally, the March NPB proposals indicated that the public must be involved in the evaluation of educational administration programs. Their position was that external evaluation and assessment would assist in strengthening the field.

Decade of Ed.D. Expansion

As the reform movement percolated throughout the 1980s, colleges of education across America were speeding up the movement into more applied doctoral work. A brief review, however, of the history of the Ed.D. illustrates the origin of the degree, its widespread acceptance, and prefaces the occurrences of the recently past 1980s.

In 1920 the School of Education at Harvard University announced its intention to offer a Doctor of Education (Ed.D.) degree. This move avoided confrontation with traditional oriented members of the Harvard faculty who held to the idea that Ph.D. degrees were awarded for advanced scholarship and original research. Harvard's Ed.D. was designed for advanced scholarship and applied research. This move by Harvard, along with the merger 22 years earlier of Teachers College with Columbia University, placed schools of education as distinct units within universities

(CA Postsecondary Education Committee, 1987). This move both elevated and isolated education as an academic discipline.

The concept of the Ed.D. was widely accepted and, by 1940, 24 institutions were offering the Ed.D.; 67 by 1960; 97 by 1970; and 128 by 1982 - 86 which offered a Ph.D. in education as well as an Ed.D. (Andersen cited in CA Postsecondary Education Committee, 1987). Studies starting as early as the 1930s and continuing to the present show little differences between the Ed.D. and Ph.D.

Acceptance by the professions and by higher education has led the a continued expansion of the Ed.D. degree. In the 1980s, over 45 new Ed.D. programs were initiated. Seventeen of these were in educational administration and leadership.

For many of the institutions in the 1980s that began offering the Ed.D. in administration and leadership it represented their first doctoral program. A common theme for these 17 institutions is that they are, for the most part, regional universities serving a regional clientele.

A further analysis of these 17 programs revealed that in order to offer a degree and attract students many institutions felt they needed to have some type of special or innovative characteristic. For example, the University of Vermont is training administrators for rural schools. Their doctorate is based at the University and programming was broadened to include faculty from colleges other than education. The University of Northern Iowa is the only state supported institution in Iowa to offer the Ed.D and their focus is primarily on the principal--a large number of whom are in the secondary school track. Nova is a large university without walls with a considerable amount of course content delivered at sites throughout the country.

What generalizations can be made regarding the new Ed.D. programs of the 1980s? The following ten seem to ring true:

1. Ed.D. programs in administration average 11 admissions per year and 7 graduates. (Nova is the exception.)
2. Most programs are operating at or above capacity.
3. Many programs were designed to attract a local clientele and meet that market need.
4. There is widespread use of the cohort model.
5. This is the first doctorate at many of these institutions.
6. Inadequate funding and no faculty load changes seem to be common concerns.
7. There is very wide local acceptance of the Ed.D. program.
8. Often there are frequent outreach programs to remote service areas.
9. There is some flexibility in the residency requirement or a desire to invoke a more flexible approach.
10. Many old university--new university hybrid models exist.

What was not found was a curriculum that differed in a large measure from the traditional doctorate programs. And the curriculum that was delivered was delivered in a similar fashion to most other university graduate school models. Finally, even in the programs of the eighties there was ample evidence that recruitment and selection of students was business as usual.

In sum, there is little to distinguish the programs of the 1980s from older programs. In terms of student admission, program content and delivery format, dissertations, and exit criteria there is great similarity to the past. While there does appear to be some adjustments to the delivery format (weekend work, outreach courses) and residency requirements, there does not appear, among these programs of the 80s, any which offer considerably new ideas for leadership of public education in the coming decades. It is very unlikely that public schools in this nation will be fundamentally improved and transformed unless the way in which the leaders of the nineties and beyond are offered a transformed model of training in their pursuit of the Ed.D.

REFERENCES

Anderson, R. H. (1990). Leadership for the transformation of education. Unpublished manuscript.

Boyer, E. L. (1983). High school. New York: Harper and Row Publishing Co.

California Postsecondary Education Commission. (1987). The doctorate in education: Issues of supply and demand in California. Sacramento CA: Postsecondary Education Commission.

Cunningham, L. L. (1985). Leaders and leadership: 1985 and beyond. Phi Delta Kappan, pp. 17-20.

Cunningham, L. L. (1990). Leadership for the transformation of education. Unpublished manuscript.

Goodlad, J. I. (1984). A place called school. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co.

Griffiths, D. E., Stout, R. T., Forsyth, P. B. (Eds.). (1988). Leaders for America's schools: The report and papers of the national commission on excellence in educational administration. Berkeley, CA: McCutchan Publishing Co.

Kelley, E. A. (1990). Leadership for the transformation of education. Unpublished manuscript.

Meade, E. J. (1990). Leadership for the transformation of education. Unpublished manuscript.

Mitchell, B., & Cunningham, L. L. (Eds.). (1990). Educational leadership and changing contexts of families, communities, and schools. Chicago, IL: National Society for the Study of Education.

Murphy, J. (1990). (Ed.). The educational reform movement of the 1980s: Perspectives and cases. Berkeley, CA: McCutchan Publishing Co.

Office of Educational Leadership. (1990). Transforming education: The Minnesota plan. St. Paul: Minnesota Department of Education.

National Policy Board for Educational Administration (1989, May). Improving the preparation of school administrators: An agenda for reform. A Report of the National Policy Board for Educational Administration. Charlottsville, VA: University of Virginia.

Sizer, T. R. (1985). Horace's compromise: The dilemma of the American high school. Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin Co.

Thompson, D. C., & Bailey, G. D. (1990). The leadership academy: New frontiers in university/public school cooperation. Educational Horizons, pp. 208-212.